

## **REMARKS**

These remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed July 6, 2010. The specification has been amended to set forth the proper language for the Government Support clause. Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's statement that claims 1 and 11-14 are allowable. The amendments to the claims are supported at, for example, paragraph [0012] (the sequences in claim 1) and pages 8-9; other amendments are provided to correct antecedent basis. No new matter is believed to have been introduced.

### **I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH**

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to the amended claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the written description requirement was implemented to prevent Applicants from amending claims to include material that lacked support (i.e., "written description") in the specification. Here, the claims were not amended and find support in the specification and in the original claims as filed.

Turning to the specifics of the rejection, the Patent Office alleges that claim 8 lacks support for mono- or polyiodination. However, a careful reading of the specification will teach one of skill in the art the location and methods for iodination, which are routinely performed in the art. However, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 8 to be consistent with the support found at page 8-9 of the specification. Thus, the rejection may be properly withdrawn.

### **II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

Claims 2, 3, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Patent Office alleges that claim 2 is indefinite because it is unclear what particular iodinated aromatic modifications are being referred to in the claim. Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would be able to readily

identify what types of modifications are being referred to with reference to the specification and structure of the compounds comprising SEQ ID NOs:1-9 and 10. However, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 2 to set for a specific embodiment of the disclosure. Support can be found at pages 8-9. Accordingly, the rejection may be properly withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected for lacking antecedent basis for the term "analog". Applicants have amended claim 3 and 5 to set forth proper antecedent basis. The rejection may be properly withdrawn.

### **III. PRIORITY DOCUMENT**

Applicants respectfully submit that the priority claims in the present application are to US applications and an International Application only. It is unclear to Applicants where the reference to a Japanese application has been set forth. Applicants can find no reference to a Japanese application in any of the filing documents, Request, PCT publication, Oath/Declaration, or the Cross-Reference to Related Applications reference on the first page of the present application.

For at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentable and request reconsideration and notice of such allowable subject matter.

The Director is authorized to charge any required fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-4586, please reference the attorney docket number above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number, if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.

Respectfully submitted,

GAVRILOVICH, DODD & LINDSEY LLP

Date: September 27, 2010

By: /Joseph R. Baker, Jr./

Joseph R. Baker, Jr.

Registration No. 40900

4660 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 750  
San Diego, California 92122  
(858) 458-3607 (Main)  
(858) 458-9986 (Fax)